The distinctiveness of syntax for varieties of Post-classical and Byzantine Greek: Linguistic upgrading from the third century BCE to the tenth century CE

Abstract: Specialists of the history of Ancient Greek scholarship and modern-day sociolinguists alike have made observations regarding the seemingly “distinctive” status of syntax: the former have argued there is no coherent theory of syntax in Ancient grammatical treatises, and the latter that syntactic variation is much less prominent in modern languages than lexical or phonetic/orthographic variation. The aim of this contribution is to confront these two perspectives by studying linguistic variation in three different types of sources: petitions in the Katochoi of the Sarapieion archive (II BCE), Phrynichus’ Ecloga (II CE), and the Life of Euthymius and its later metaphrasis (VI/X CE). It appears that syntactic variation plays a different role in these three types of sources, which I explain by referring to the cognitive status of syntax, which is more schematic and complex than lexis, and therefore less easily focused upon in “observer-centered” sources such as the Ecloga. At the same time, I suggest that culture-specific explanations should be taken into account, too.

“It seems . . . that there is a difference between syntax and the rest of language which needs to be explained” (Hudson 1996: 43)

1 Introduction: The distinctive status of syntax

The absence of syntactic observations¹ is well-known among those who study the history of Ancient Greek scholarship.² As Donnet (1967: 27) writes, “Ia
syntaxe n’ pas été, dans l’Antiquité et au Moyen Age, érigée en branche autonome de la grammaire.”

3 Even Apollonius Dyscolus, the author of a separate treatise *On syntax*, was more interested in morphology and semantic/logical distinctions than syntax properly speaking. 4 Similarly, in the tradition of writings on language correctness (so-called *hellenismos*), 5 “the available documentation suggests they addressed such issues as the correct meaning of words, prosody, choice among phonetic-orthographic variants, use of etymological and dialectal considerations, as well as the pursuit of linguistic regularities on the basis of analogical reasoning, *whereas no reference attests that these works also dealt with syntax*” (Pagani 2015: 816 [my emphasis]). 6

The separate status of syntax has also been emphasized in a quite different area of research, that is, modern-day sociolinguistics. Sociolinguists have separated syntax, together with lexis and morphology, from pronunciation/orthography on the basis of the fact that there is invariance of meaning between phonological/orthographic variants, but that this is not necessarily the case with syntactic, lexical or morphological variants (an issue which is known as “the sociolinguistic variable”). 7 Such invariance of meaning is typically postulated by (historical) sociolinguists, who want to study the social factors behind linguistic variation, and thereby assume that semantic and discourse-factors do not play a significant role. As Berruto (2004: 314) notes, such an assumption “tends to become increasingly problematic and difficult to establish once we change the level of analysis and move form phonetics/phonology to morphology to lexicon to syntax to pragmatics.”

More interesting for our present purposes is the fact that syntax has also been contrasted on its own with the other linguistic levels on the basis of the fact that syntax would display less variation than lexis or phonology/orthography, and would therefore be less marked. As Berruto (2009: 21) writes, scholars tend to think of syntax as “il livello di analisi piu ‘duro’, meno sensibile e meno coinvolto nella variazione.” 8 The most specific proposal that has been made in

---

3 “Syntax was not established in antiquity and the Middle Ages as an autonomous branch of grammar.”
7 For further discussion, see e.g. Romaine (1982: 31–37).
8 “The most ‘difficult’ level of analysis, less sensitive and less involved in variation.” Compare Hess-Lüttich (2004: 496): “Soziolekte wurden bislang überhaupt zumeist als primär lexikalisch
this regard is that by Hudson (1996), who hypothesizes that the different linguistic levels, and the variants that can be found along these levels, have different relations to society: Hudson considers syntax to be “the marker of cohesion in society”, “with individuals trying to eliminate alternatives in syntax from their individual language” (Hudson 1996: 45). Lexis, on the other hand, is a “marker of division in society”, with individuals “actively cultivat[ing] alternatives in order to make more subtle social distinctions” (Hudson 1996: 45). Pronunciation, finally, “reflects the permanent social group with which the speaker identifies” (Hudson 1996: 45).

Studies in Greek linguistics have only partly confirmed the picture drawn by Hudson (1996) and other sociolinguists. Torallas Tovar (this volume), for example, considers orthography and vocabulary to be the most “visible” aspects of a text, which goes along the lines of Hudson’s proposal. At the same time, many studies have highlighted the existence and significance of syntactic variation in the Post-classical and Byzantine periods, commenting on issues of textual coherence (particles), case, aspect, tense, word order, etc. The main aim of this chapter will therefore be to analyze what role the traditionally recognized linguistic levels (pronunciation/orthography, lexis, morphology, and syntax) play in different types of sources from Antiquity, in other words, to investigate what importance people in Antiquity attached to different types of variation.

The chapter is structured as follows: in Section 2, I briefly discuss the sources that can help us clarify whether syntax had, indeed, a distinctive position for users of Greek in Antiquity; in Section 3, I analyze the different sources, discussing orthography, morphology, syntax, and lexis in detail. Before concluding the chapter in Section 5, I discuss some of the difficulties that one encounters in classifying items according to the traditionally recognized linguistic levels, and propose to reinterpret these levels in terms of a “syntax-lexis” continuum (§4). Such a reinterpretation, I argue, also explains the distributional differences which we find in our sources.

zu identifizierende beschrieben” [“So far, sociolects have generally been described as primarily lexically identifiable.”]

9 Hudson’s (1996) argumentation is to a large extent based on earlier work by Gumperz and Wilson (1971).

10 Hudson (1996) does not say much about morphology. Berruto (2009: 21) considers morphology, together with syntax, to be more stable than vocabulary and orthography. Hudson (1996: 43), on the other hand, writes that “it is certainly the case that examples of syntactic differences within a variety are much less frequently quoted in the literature than differences in either pronunciation or morphology, which are in any case hard to keep separate.”

11 See e.g. some of my recent publications (Bentein 2015b, 2016, 2017).
2 Primary sources: A reconceptualization

Scholars studying (the development of) the Greek language have often noted the difficulty of working with the primary sources that have survived. Browning (1983: 4–5) for example has noted that, “in spite of the large number of texts surviving from all periods, it is often difficult to trace the development of the language as it was actually used in most situations. The real process of change is masked by a factitious, classicizing uniformity.” Browning (1983: 4–5) therefore distinguishes texts and genres which display “features of the spoken language”, such as non-literary papyri, world chronicles, tales of ascetics, and lives of saints, from others which do not. The language of the latter type of texts is considered to be “equivalent” to that of Classical Greek, and therefore without interest. In one recent volume (Herring, Van Reenen and Schøsler 2000), these texts and the linguistic features they contain have been qualified as “non-authentic”, whereas “spoken-like”, “oral” textual data are qualified as “authentic”.

Others scholars, however, have reacted against this dichotomy and the viewpoint it implies, by noting that “authentic” texts, too, must have contained archaic features, and that vice-versa “non-authentic” texts, must have contained innovative features. A new generation of scholars has set it as its goal to study the entire Greek language – “[to] look at Greek in all its varieties”, as Horrocks (2010: 4) writes. Register is a key term in this context: the differences that have been noted by previous scholars can be referred to in terms of “higher” and “lower” registers, which need to be compared to each other. In this context, one can refer to the “register-continuum” which I have proposed for Post-classical Greek in a number of publications, as illustrated in Figure 1.

![Figure 1: The Post-classical Greek register-continuum (from Bentein 2013).](image-url)

---

12 Part of the discussion in this section is based on Bentein (2013).
13 Browning (1983: 5) notes, however, that “none of these works is in any sense a reproduction of contemporary spoken Greek; they are mixtures of living speech and dead tradition”.
15 For further qualification, see Bentein (2015a). For the register continuum, see also Stolk (this volume, §1.1).
One of the disadvantages of a continuum like this is that it does not really take into account the wide range of sources that have actually been preserved. We do not only possess higher- and lower-register literary and non-literary texts, but also texts which offer a fascinating first-hand perspective towards the social evaluation of linguistic features. To be more specific, I am referring to sources such as schoolbooks, grammatical treatises, lexica, annotated manuscripts, documentary texts with scribal corrections, stylistically revised texts, *metaphraseis*, etc. Whereas some of these sources have started to be taken into account in recent linguistic research, much more remains to be done with them. I suggest that they, too, can be placed on a continuum, which ranges from “user-centered” sources to “observer-centered” sources, with at one extremity texts which do not show any explicit social evaluations, and at the other texts which deal explicitly with such evaluations, such as schoolbooks, grammatical treatises and lexica. In between, we can locate annotated manuscripts, stylistically revised texts, and documentary texts with scribal corrections, as shown in Figure 2.

![Figure 2: The user-observer continuum.](image)

In what follows, I will analyze the role that syntax plays in texts which display social evaluations more or less explicitly. For this purpose, I have selected three different types of sources, spanning the time-period from the third century BCE to the tenth century CE, all of which are concerned with linguistic upgrading: (i) documentary petitions from the so-called “Katochoi of the Sarapieion archive” (III BCE); (ii) Phrynichus’ Atticist lexicon, the *Ecloga*, and (iii) the metaphrasis of the *Life of Euthymius* (VI/X CE).

---

16 See e.g. Luiselli (2010), Cuomo (2017), Stolk (this volume).
17 Note that the reverse phenomenon, linguistic downgrading, is also attested in later Byzantine times. See e.g. Wahlgren (2010: 537).
3 Linguistic upgrading from the third century BCE to the tenth century CE

3.1 The Katochoi of the Sarapieion archive (II BCE)

The first collection of texts that I want to have a closer look at is the so-called “Katochoi of the Sarapieion archive”,18 which is dated to the second century BCE (164–151 BCE). The main figures of this archive are the brothers Ptolemaios and Apollonios, sons of Glaukias, an officer of Macedonian origins. The eldest son, Ptolemaios, was born around the end of the third century BCE in a village called Psichis. After a rudimentary Greek education in the village, he became a recluse in the Great Sarapieion in Memphis in 172 BCE, where he entered in service of the God Sarapis, and probably remained so until his death.19

Ptolemaios was especially close to one of his four siblings, his younger brother Apollonios. Since Apollonios was only eight when their father died (164 BCE), Ptolemaios became a kind of substitute father, relying not only on Apollonios as a liaison to the outside world, but also as a scribe: about half of the documents in the archive are written in the hand of Apollonios. Apollonios was able to write fast, but his education must have been quite basic. As Lewis (1986: 76) notes: “his writing is uneven and unattractive in appearance, his spelling even worse than his older brother’s, and his grammar rudimentary and erratic.”20

At the age of fifteen/sixteen, Apollonios joined his brother as a recluse in the Great Sarapieion. After physical violence against the brothers by some Egyptians with anti-Greek feelings, Ptolemaios petitioned the King in order to secure for his brother a military appointment in the Graeco-Macedonian corps stationed at Memphis, which was granted. The texts in the archive show that after this appointment, Apollonios frequently visited his brother in the Sarapieion, bringing food supplies or simply visiting. At the Sarapieion, Ptolemaios also took care of the twin girls Thaues and Taous, who could not write Greek, and therefore needed a representative in their correspondence with Greek officials. Having been thrown out of the house by their mother, the twins were able to enter into the service of Sarapis too, where they remained for seven or more years.21

---

18 For historical background, see a.o. Wilcken (1927: 104–116), Lewis (1986: 69–87), Hoogendijk (1989), LeGras (2011: esp. 169–89), Bentein (2015a), Vierros (this volume). This archive is also known as the “Ptolemaios archive” (Hoogendijk 1989: 47).
19 Cf. Lewis (1986: 75).
20 For a linguistic analysis of the archive, see Bentein (2015a), Vierros (this volume).
In its present state, the archive contains little over one hundred texts, which have been classified by Wilcken (1927) in terms of four major text types: letters, petitions, dreams and accounts. In the context of this contribution, I want to have a closer look at the petitions in the archive: these form interesting source material, because on several occasions we have multiple versions of one and the same text, earlier versions having been linguistically upgraded. I will focus on four sets of related texts: (i) UPZ I 5 and UPZ I 6 (from Ptolemaios to the strategos Diodotus/the King, against Amosis and his companions); (ii) UPZ I 18 and UPZ I 19 (from the twins to the King, against Nephoris); (iii) UPZ I 35 and UPZ I 36 (from Ptolemaios to the hypdioikêtês Sarapion on behalf of the twins); (iv) UPZ I 52 and UPZ I 53 (from Ptolemaios to the hypdioikêtês Sarapion on behalf of the twins).

Figure 3 gives a general overview of the types of changes that have been made in these four sets of texts.

![Figure 3: Linguistic changes in the Katochoi of the Sarapieion archive.](image-url)

---

22 117 texts, according to the Trismegistos portal (last accessed 11 September 2018). The texts were edited and translated by Wilcken (1927).

23 For other related texts, see the overview given in the appendix to Bentein (2015a) and Vierros (this volume, Table 1).

24 Interestingly, a second hand has made additional corrections in UPZ I 19. My comparison is with the first hand in UPZ I 19.

25 There are two copies of UPZ I 35: UPZ I 33 and I 34.
3.1.1 Lexical changes

As Figure 3 shows, most of the linguistic changes that have been made in the petitions are lexical in nature. Almost half of these changes concern verbs, many of which express movement (or absence thereof): so, for example, ἐν κατοχῇ εἴμι > ἐν κατάκεχουμαι ‘I am in katochē’ (UPZ I 5, l. 9; UPZ I 6, l. 8), ἀπετήθησε ‘he leaped off’ > ἀποκολομβήθησαντος ‘having jumped (into)’ (UPZ I 18, l. 9; UPZ I 19, l. 11), ἔλθη εἰς νήσον ‘he went to an island’ > ἀνασωθέντος ἐπὶ τινά νήσον ‘having been saved on an island’ (UPZ I 18, l. 10; UPZ I 19, l. 12), πορεύονται ‘they went’ > ἀναπλευσάντων ‘having sailed up’ (UPZ I 18, l. 13; UPZ I 19, l. 15), ἀνεχρημεν (I. ἀνεχωρή<σα>σεν) ‘we went up’ > ἀναβάζων ‘to go up’ (UPZ I 18, l. 17; UPZ I 19, l. 23). In one case, a verb of movement is changed into a nominal expression: ἐκπορ[ει]μοι<έν·ων ‘while going out’ > ἐν τει ἔκόδωτ ‘during the exit’ (UPZ I 5, l. 11; UPZ I 6, l. 9). Several verbs of giving and taking have also been altered. So, for example, ἐξενέγκαται ‘to carry off’ > προσ[ε]οι[λό]θησαν ‘he plundered in addition’ (UPZ I 5, l. 22; UPZ I 6, l. 19), ἐνοίκιον λαμβάνει > ἐνοικιολογεῖ ‘she receives rent’ (UPZ I 18, l. 16; UPZ I 19, l. 19), δέξασθαι > προσλαβέσθαι ‘to take on’ (UPZ I 18, l. 26; UPZ I 19, l. 25), διδοὺ ‘may he give’ > [ἀν]<δ>αποδῶ ‘may he give back’ (UPZ I 52, l. 26; UPZ I 53, l. 30), and ἀποδοῦναι ‘to return’ > προσαποδοῦναι ‘to pay as a debt besides’ (UPZ I 34, l. 10; UPZ I 35, l. 22). On a couple of occasions, we also find more extensive reformulations of verbal expressions. So, for example, ἄταφος ἐστειν ‘he is unburied’ > οὐ τετόλμηκεν αὐτὸν ἡ Νεφόρης θάψαι ‘Nephoris has not had the courage to bury him’ (UPZ I 18, l. 15; UPZ I 19, ll. 16–17), καὶ ταύτα ἐξήνεγκαν ‘these things too they carried off’ > οὔθε ταύτα γε ἡμῖν ἀπέλυσον ‘not even these they left for us’ (UPZ I 5, ll. 39–40; UPZ I 6, ll. 28–29), and εὐρούντες ἐξερημωμένου τὸν τόπον ‘having found the place deserted’ > μηθέν εὐρούντες χρήσιμον ‘having found nothing of use’ (UPZ I 5, ll. 36–37; UPZ I 6, l. 28).

Less often, nouns have been altered in the archive. So, for example, τὰ δύο μολύβδινα ‘the two leaden (items)’ > τὰ ποτήρια ‘the drinking cups’ (UPZ I 5, l. 44; UPZ I 6, l. 32), εἰς Ἡρακλῆους πόλειν > τὸν Ἡρακλεοπολίτην ‘(to) Herakleopolis’ (UPZ I 18, l. 12; UPZ I 19, l. 13), ὑπὸ τῆς λύπης ‘because of grief’ > ὑπὸ τῆς ἀθυμίας ‘because of hopelessness’ (UPZ I 18, ll. 12–13; UPZ I 19, l. 14), τὴν δὲ οὐσίαν αὐτοῦ ‘his property’ > τὰ δ’ ἐκεῖνον ὑπάρχοντα ‘his possessions’ (UPZ I 18, ll. 15–16; UPZ I 19, l. 17), and οἶ δὲ γνώριμοι αὐτῆς ‘her acquaintances’ > τῶν δὲ τῆς μητρὸς φίλων ‘(of) friends of our mother’ (UPZ I 18, l. 22; UPZ I 19, ll. 24–25). Interestingly, the way people and places are referred to is also subject to lexical change, references being either more or less specific: so e.g. τῶν πτωχῶν ‘(of) the beggars’ > τῶν ἄλλων ἐνκατα[τ]η[λων] ‘(of) the others in katochē’ (UPZ I 5, l. 21; UPZ I 6, ll. 18–19), τινὸς τῶν πτωχῶν ‘(of) one of the beggars’ > Ἀρμαίχ (l. Ἀρμάδως) δὲ τινὸς ‘(of) a certain Hermail’ (UPZ I 5, l. 22; UPZ I 6, l. 19), Φιλίππωι Σωγένου ‘with Philippus
son of Sogenes’ > Φιλίππωι τιν ἔν with a certain Philippus’ (UPZ I 18, l. 4; UPZ I 19, l. 7), τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν ‘our father’ > αὐτὸν ‘him’ (UPZ I 18, l. 6; UPZ I 19, l. 8), and εἰς τὴν νεκρίαν ‘to the necropolis’ > εἰς τὰς κατὰ Μέμφιν νεκρίας ‘to the burying grounds at Memphis’ (UPZ I 18, l. 14; UPZ I 19, l. 16). Infrequently, adjectives and adverbs have been changed. Some examples include ἔξενοι-αὐτοῦ ‘yearly’ > ἐκάστου ἑνιαυτοῦ ‘every year’ (UPZ I 34, l. 5; UPZ I 35, ll. 10–11) and ἔτει (l. ἔτη) καὶ νῦν ‘even now’ > μέχρι τοῦ νῦν ‘until now’ (UPZ I 18, l. 15; UPZ I 19, l. 16).

Numbers, too, are involved in lexical changes. So, for example, alphabetic notation is replaced by an adjective on one occasion (ιξ ‘17’ > τῆ [ἐ]πτακαιδέκατη ‘on the seventeenth’ (UPZ I 5, l. 19; UPZ I 6, l. 17)), and vice versa on another (ἐνδέκατον ‘eleventh’ > ιὲ ‘11’ (UPZ I 52, l. 4; UPZ I 53, l. 4)).

To conclude, we also see that function words are subject to lexical changes. Some examples include ἐν Μέμφις > πρὸς Μέμφις ‘in Memphis’ (UPZ I 18, l. 1; UPZ I 19, l. 3), εἰς νῆσον > ἐπὶ τινα νῆσον ‘to an island’ (UPZ I 18, l. 10; UPZ I 19, l. 12), ἐν γύνῃ τοῦ ποταμοῦ > πρὸς [τὴν] ποταμιάν ‘near the river’ (UPZ I 18, ll. 8–9; UPZ I 19, l. 10) (prepositions); [τὸν ἡμέραν αὐτῆς > τὸν ἐκείνης uīν ‘her son’ (UPZ I 18, l. 22; UPZ I 19, l. 25), αὐτόν > τοῦτον ‘him’ (UPZ I 5, l. 25; UPZ I 6, l. 21) (pronouns); μὴ > μῆτοςτε ‘(I fear) that’ (UPZ I 35, l. 17; UPZ I 36, l. 15) (complementisers); δὲ > τε (UPZ I 5, l. 11; UPZ I 6, l. 10), καὶ ‘and’ > οὐ μὴν [ἂ]λλά καὶ ‘not only but also’ (UPZ I 5, l. 26; UPZ I 6, l. 22), ὁδὸν > διάπερ ‘so’ (UPZ I 5, l. 46; UPZ I 6, l. 32) (particles).

3.1.2 Syntactic changes

Syntactic changes occur second most frequently in our archive. Two types of syntactic changes are particularly often attested. First, in the area of word order, we see a conscious effort to place the syntactic “head” after, rather than in front of, its complements, which had become the usual word order in Post-classical Greek.26 Some examples of verb phrases include εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸ τής θεᾶς ἀδύτουν > εἰς τὸ ἀδύτον τῆς θεᾶς εἰσελθὼν ‘having entered the sanctuary of the goddess’ (UPZ I 5, ll. 26–27; UPZ I 6, l. 22), εἰς τὴν νεκρίαν καθεστώτων ‘they brought him to the necropolis’ > παρακομισανίων αὐτῶν εἰς τὰς κατὰ Μέμφιν νεκρίας ‘having conveyed him to the burying grounds at Memphis’ (UPZ I 18, l. 14; UPZ I 19, ll. 15–16), καθεστώτα αὐτῶν εἰς Ἡρακλέως τὸν ἡμερολόγησαν καθεστώτα αὐτῶν εἰς Ἡρακλέως τὸν ἡμερολόγησαν καθεστώτα αὐτῶν εἰς Ἡρακλέως τὴν χωρίαν τοῦτον χρωμάτων ‘having gone off to the Herakleopolite nome’ (UPZ I 18, ll. 11–12; UPZ I 19, ll. 13–14), and ἀποθνῄσκει ἐκεί ὑπὸ τῆς λύπης ‘he died there because of grief’ > ὑπὸ τῆς

26 See e.g. Levinsohn (2000), Horrocks (2007).
ἀδυμίας μετήλλαξεν τὸν βίον ‘he departed life because of hopelessness’ (UPZ I 18, ll. 12–13; UPZ I 19, ll. 14–15). We see the same phenomenon at a lower syntactic level, that of the noun phrase: στάμνων αὐτοῦ > τ[ὸ]ν αὐτοῦ στάμνων ‘his storage jar’ (UPZ I 5, l. 23; UPZ I 6, l. 20), τοῦ δὲ πατρὸς ἡμῶν > ἡμῶν . . . τοῦ πατρὸς ‘(of) our father’ (UPZ I 18, l. 19; UPZ I 19, l. 22), and [τὸν οὐ]λὸν αὐτῆς > τὸν έκείνης νῦν ‘her son’ (UPZ I 18, l. 22; UPZ I 19, l. 25). In two cases, however, we see the opposite syntactic movement: τὸ τῆς θεᾶς ὀδυτὸν > τὸ ὀδυτὸν τῆς θεᾶς ‘the sanctuary of the goddess’ (UPZ I 5, ll. 26–27; UPZ I 6, l. 22) and τὸν ἐπιστάτην τὸν ἱερῶν Ψινταήν > Ψινταήν τὸν ἐπιστάτην [τ]ῶν ἱερῶν ‘Psintaes overseer of the priests’ (UPZ I 52, l. 2; UPZ I 53, ll. 23–24).

Another major type of syntactic change concerns participial syntax.²⁷ Very often, main verbs in the indicative mood are changed into participles (genitive absolute constructions in particular). Some examples include: παραλαβόντες φυλακίτας καὶ φυλακίτας εἰστήκαν ‘having taken phylakitai they entered’ > παραλαβόντες φυλακίτας καὶ εἰσέλθοντον ‘having taken phylakitai and having entered’ (UPZ I 5, ll. 7–8; UPZ I 6, l. 7), ἀδεικούμεθα ὑπὸ Νε[φό]ριτος ‘we are being wronged by Nephoris’ > ἀδεικούμεθα ὑπὸ Νεφόριτος ‘being wronged by Nephoris’ (UPZ I 18, l. 2; UPZ I 19, l. 4), οἱ δελφοὶ (οἱ ἀδελφοί) αὐτοῦ πορέευονται ‘his brothers went’ > τῶν δὲ ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ ἀναπλευσάντων ‘his brothers having sailed up’ (UPZ I 18, l. 13; UPZ I 19, l. 15), and ἄγουσιν καὶ εἰς τὴν νεκρᾶν καθεστώτιν αὐτοῦ ‘they went to fetch him and brought him to the necropolis’ > [[ἀγαγόντων]] καὶ παρακομισάντων αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς κατὰ Μέμφιν νεκρὰς ‘having brought and conveyed him to the burying grounds at Memphis’ (UPZ I 18, ll. 14–15; UPZ I 19, ll. 15–16). In two cases, however, we see the reverse syntactic movement, whereby a participle in the first version is changed into a main verb in the indicative in the second version: συνοικήσασα Φιλίππου Σωγένου ‘having set up house with Philippus son of Sogenes’ > συνώικησε Φιλίππωι τινὶ ‘she lived with a certain Philippus’ (UPZ I 18, l. 4; UPZ I 19, l. 6) and ἐκβάλλουσα ἡμᾶς ‘throwing us out’ > ἔξεβαλεν ἡμᾶς ‘she threw us out’ (UPZ I 18, l. 17; UPZ I 19, l. 20). It is interesting to note that in the first of these two instances a second hand has stricken through the main verb συνώικησε and changed it into the participle συνοικῶσα ‘living together’.

Next to word order and participial syntax, various other types of syntactic changes are made. For example, we see that the active voice is sometimes changed into the passive voice: so, e.g., Ψούλλω . . . ἀπέσταλκεν ‘Psulis has sent’ > ἀπ[ε]στάλθη[ν] ὑπὸ Ψούλλων ‘to have been sent by Psulis’ (UPZ I 5, ll. 42–43; UPZ I 6, l. 31), and εἰλήφες ‘she took’ > ἀναληφθέντα ‘having been confiscated’ (UPZ I

²⁷ For some observations, see also Vierros (this volume, §3.3).
Definiteness is also an area where changes are made: the indefinite pronoun is added in cases such as *εἰς νῆσον* > *ἐπί τινα νῆσον* ‘to an island’ (UPZ I 18, l. 10; UPZ I 19, l. 12), *Θέωνι* > *Θέωνι τινί* ‘to (a certain) Theon’ (UPZ I 5, 26; UPZ I 6, 21), and *τῶ (l. τῶ<ν>) έν κατοχῇ > τινα τῶν έν κατοχῇ ὅντων* ‘one of the people living in katochē’ (UPZ I 18, ll. 18–19; UPZ I 19, l. 22), and in one case the definite article is added: *Θέωνι Παῦτος > Θέωνι . . . τῷ Παῆτ [οϲ] ‘Theon son of Paes’ (UPZ I 5, l. 26; UPZ I 6, l. 21). In the area of complementation/subordination, too, we see a number of interesting changes, which cannot be easily grouped under one heading. So, for example, there is a change from direct to indirect speech in *πυθομένων δ ἡμῶν τίνος χάριν ἐπισπορεύεσθε* ‘when we asked: why do you intrude’ > *πυθανομένων δ ἡμῶν τίνος χάριν ἐησαν εἰσπεπορευμένοι* ‘when we asked why they had entered’ (UPZ I 5, ll. 40–41; UPZ I 6, ll. 29–30); a change from the bare infinitive to *ὡς* with the future indicative: *ἐπέταξαν αὐτῷ ἀποκτῖναι* ‘they ordered him to kill’ > *ἐξηράζετο* ‘she contrived that he would destroy’ (UPZ I 18, l. 6; UPZ I 19, l. 8); a change from *ἀν* with the subjunctive to the bare infinitive: *ἐκ νοστοῦ ἦν* > *ἐκ νοστοῦ ἦν* ‘to serve us’ (UPZ I 18, l. 23; UPZ I 19, l. 25); and a change from a participle to *ὥστε* with the infinitive: *πινοὺντες* ‘starving’ > *ὥστε αὖν κινδυνεύειν τῷ λιμῷ διαλυθήναι* ‘so that we are in danger of perishing from starvation’ (UPZ I 18, l. 17; UPZ I 19, ll. 20–21).

### 3.1.3 Orthographic changes

Orthographic changes are also quite prominent in the archive. Most of these concern vowels, reflecting changes in pronunciation that were ongoing already in the Early Ptolemaic period, as such as the loss of quantitative distinctions, the convergence of *ει*, *ι*, *η*, etc. in pronunciation towards /i/ ("itacism"), and the reduction of diphthongs to simple vowels. Some examples include: *χάρειν* > *χάριν* ‘grace’ (UPZ I 35, l. 13; UPZ I 36, l. 11), *ἐπί* > *ἐπεί* ‘since’ (UPZ I 35, l. 17; UPZ I 36, l. 14), *τῶπους* > *τόπους* ‘places’ (UPZ I 35, l. 18; UPZ I 36, l. 16), *ἱκοστοῦ* > *ἱκοστοῦ* ‘(of) the twentieth’ (UPZ I 35, l. 19; UPZ I 36, l. 16), *ἀπέδοκα* > *ἀπεδώκα* ‘I delivered’ (UPZ I 35, l. 5; UPZ I 36, l. 5), *βοηθείας* > *βοηθείας* ‘(of) help’ (UPZ I 5, l. 53; UPZ I 6, l. 38), *προεῖ* > *πρὺ* ‘early in the day’ (UPZ I 5, l. 20; UPZ I 6, l. 17), *ὀφειλομένας* > *ὀφειλομένας* ‘required’ (UPZ I 52, l. 24; UPZ I 53, l. 25), *ἄδικοῦνται* > *ἄδικοῦνται* ‘they are being wronged’ (UPZ I 52, l. 9; UPZ I 53, l. 10), and *ἄδεικνύμεθα* ‘we are being wronged’ > *ἄδεικνύμεναι* ‘being wronged’ (UPZ I 18, l. 2; UPZ I 19, l. 4).
As can be expected, the second version in each set of petitions tends to correct irregular orthography, but on some occasions it introduces additional mistakes and hypercorrections: so, for example, ἐν τούτοις > ἐν τούτος ‘in these matters’ (UPZ I 35, l. 16; UPZ I 36, l. 14), οὐκ > εἰς ‘not’ (UPZ I 52, l. 11; UPZ I 53, l. 12), ἡμισι > ἡμισου ‘half’ (UPZ I 52, l. 15; UPZ I 53, l. 17), Μακεδόνος > Μακεδόνος ‘Macedonian’ (UPZ I 52, l. 2; UPZ I 53, l. 2), and σοι > σι ‘to you’ (UPZ I 52, l. 26; UPZ I 53, l. 30). As can be seen, all of these additional misrepresentations occur in the two sets of texts addressed to Sarapion the hypodioikêtês, which is probably not a coincidence. Paleographical evidence shows that these two sets of texts were written by the same hand, that of Apollonios.29 In trying to upgrade these petitions himself, Apollonios must have introduced new mistakes.

Orthographic misrepresentations are much less prominent when it comes to consonants.30 Here, too, misrepresentations reflect pronunciation changes that are in progress, such as the confusion between voiced and voiceless consonants (e.g. τ for δ), the confusion between voiceless and aspirated voiceless consonants (e.g. π for φ), and consonant cluster reduction (e.g. τ for ντ). Some examples include διαρπάζεται > διαρπάζεται ‘it is robbed’ (UPZ I 52, l. 20; UPZ I 53, l. 21), νομίσαντα > νομίσαντα ‘having considered’ (UPZ I 35, l. 20; UPZ 36, l. 17), and βασιλίσης > βασιλῆς ‘of the queen’ (UPZ I 35, l. 6; UPZ I 36, l. 6). Occasionally, misrepresentations that can be less easily connected to the changes in pronunciation are corrected. So, for example, ἐταναγκάσαι > ἐπαναγκάσαι ‘to compel’ (UPZ I 52, l. 23; UPZ I 53, l. 24) and ἀξιούμεν > ἀξιοῦμεν ‘we ask’ (UPZ I 52, l. 21; UPZ I 53, l. 22).

### 3.1.4 Morphological changes

Least often, morphology is involved in the linguistic changes that have been made. In the area of verb morphology, the archive contains a couple of examples where one type of aorist formation is changed into another. So for, example, we find ἐξηνέγκαντο ‘they carried off’ > ἐξήνεγκεν ‘he carried off’ (UPZ I 5, l. 18; UPZ I 6, l. 16), σκύλαντες > σκυλῆς ‘having robbed’ (UPZ I 5, l. 18; UPZ I 6, l. 15), and ἔσκυλαν ‘they robbed’ > ἐσκύλην ‘he robbed’ (UPZ I 5, l. 27; UPZ I 6, l. 22). Interestingly, there are also examples where one aspectual stem is changed into the other: διδο > δο ‘may he give (UPZ I 35, l. 12; UPZ I 36, l. 11), πυθομένων ‘having inquired’ > πυθανομένου ‘while inquiring’ (UPZ I 5, l. 40;

---

29 Cf. Wilcken (1927: 115).
UPZ I 6, l. 29), and ἡνομημένον ‘having been used lawlessly’ > ἀνουμο/ύ/μενον ‘being used lawlessly’ (UPZ I 5, l. 47; UPZ I 6, l. 34). In one case, the aorist endings of the verb γίνομαι are changed from middle to passive: γενομένου > ἐπιγενηθέντος ‘having occurred’ (UPZ I 18, l. 20; UPZ I 19, l. 23).

In the area of nominal morphology, even less changes can be noted. In one case, a plural form is changed into a singular form: εὐτυχία > εὑρυχία ‘success (es)’ (UPZ I 35, l. 30; UPZ I 36, l. 25). In a number of other cases, we see that endings are changed: παν τὸν τόπον > πάντα τὸν τόπον ‘the entire place’ (UPZ I 5, l. 11; UPZ I 6, l. 11), ἐπαφροδισίαν > ἐπαφροδισία ‘charm’ (UPZ I 35, l. 28; UPZ I 36, l. 24), ἀντιπεσον > ἀντιπεσόντα ‘having resisted’ (UPZ I 35, l. 26; UPZ I 36, l. 21), and ἔλαιον ‘olive oil’ > ἐλαίου ‘(of) olive oil’ (UPZ I 35, l. 24; UPZ I 36, l. 20).

To conclude the discussion on the Katochoi of the Sarapieion archive, it is worth drawing attention to some noticeable differences between the texts included in our archive: in the last two sets of petitions, UPZ I 35/36 and UPZ I 52/53, orthographic changes are much more common than in the other texts in the archive. This becomes clear in the following Figure, which graphically represents the types of changes made only in these two sets of texts (compare with our earlier Figure 3).

**Figure 4:** Linguistic changes in UPZ I 35/36 and UPZ I 52/53.

As I mentioned before, this noticeable difference between the first two sets of petitions and the last two sets of petitions can be connected to paleographical differences: the first two sets of petitions are written by an elegant chancery hand,
and in these texts orthography is much less an issue. The last two sets of petitions, on the other hand, are written by the hand of Apollonios, indicating that he himself was responsible for the linguistic upgrading. In doing so, Apollonios mainly focused on orthography, making only a couple of changes in the areas of syntax, morphology, and the lexicon. That changes are much less thorough-going can perhaps also be connected to the social status of the respective addressees: the first two sets of petitions are addressed to the King, whereas the last two sets of petitions are addressed to Sarapion the hypdioikêtês, a lower official.

3.2 Phrynichus’ Ecloga (II CE)

The second source which I consider here is a lexicographical treatise from the second century, by the hand of Phrynichus.31 Phrynichus was a rhetorician from the later second century CE, and one of the strictest Atticists.32 Swain (1996: 55) connects this to Phrynichus’ origins: Photius calls him an “Arabian”,33 which would have meant that he was a non-Greek speaker by birth, who had to learn the rules by hard work, and was therefore opposed to anyone challenging those rules.

Two of Phrynichus’ works survive, both of them dealing with proper Atticist usage. The first is called Ἐκλογὴ Ἀττικῶν ῥημάτων (Ecloga)35 and is much shorter, comprising only two books. It was originally considered an epitome, but is now thought to be more or less complete. It was dedicated to the imperial secretary, Sulpicius Cornelianus, and can be dated back to 178 CE. Phrynichus’ two works have much the same purpose, although, as Lee (2013: 288–289) notes, not entirely: the Ecloga is primarily a list of what needs to be avoided, and what needs to be used instead,36 whereas the

31 On Phrynichus, see e.g. Swain (1996: 54–56), Dickey (2007: 96–97), OCD, s.v.
32 Phrynichus finds “mistakes” in writers such as Demosthenes (CCXXIII), Lysias (CCCXXXI), Sophocles (CLXIII), and Xenophon (LXXI).
33 The Suda, on the other hand, says that Phrynichus was born in Bithynia. As Swain (1996: 55) notes, this statement need not be contradictory, since the sophists travelled around quite a bit.
34 Edited by de Borries (1911).
35 Text editions include Rutherford (1881) (with commentary) and Fischer (1974). In what follows, references are made to Rutherford’s (1881) edition.
36 While this is standard practice in the Ecloga, it is not always the case: for example, Phrynichus will sometimes start with a good word, and then give the bad alternative (e.g. CCXC). On other occasions, he does not give an alternative (e.g. XLVIII), simply mentions that
Praeparatio Sophistica aims to suggest or explain a useful Attic expression, without necessarily naming the equivalent feature that needs to be avoided.

Since both of Phrynichus’ works are arranged in the form of a lexicon, Phrynichus is traditionally characterized as a “lexicographer”, and his works as “lexica”.37 As several scholars have noted, however, their purpose was much wider: Swain (1996: 54), for example, describes the purpose of Phrynichus’ Praeparatio Sophistica as “to provide guidance on vocabulary, grammar, and style for literature, rhetoric, and conversational purposes, as well as for satirical writing . . . and, interestingly, for the language of love.” In similar vein, Kim (2010: 477) has noted that lexica such as Phrynichus’ Ecloga “[cover] more than vocabulary; many entries deal with phonology, morphology, and occasionally syntax”.38 As the following Figure shows, Kim’s judgment is quite right: about 60% of the entries are lexical in nature, while the rest of the entries deal with morphology, syntax and orthography.

![Figure 5: Entries in Phrynichus’ Ecloga.](image)

a word is “to be deleted” (e.g. CCCLXVIII), or does not mention a good alternative, leaving the lemma open for further comments (e.g. CCL).

37 So also Dickey (2007). Contrast Lee (2013), who explicitly speaks of “the Atticist grammarians”.

38 For a typology of “lexica”, see Tosi (2015), who discusses Phrynichus’ Ecloga under the heading of “lexica whose content is more properly morphological and orthographic” (Tosi 2015: 632).

39 Entries that concern more than one linguistic level have been counted double.
3.2.1 Lexical entries

Most of the lexical entries in the Ecloga concerns nouns and verbs. Nouns are discussed most often: there are about twice as many entries on nouns as there are on verbs (approx. 125 vs. 66). Many of these involve the replacement of one term, which is to be avoided, with its proper “Attic” variant: so, for example, ἐφεύγοιθαί > ἐφυγγάνεν ‘to belch’ (XLV), ἀναιδεύεσθαι > ἀναιδίζεσθαι ‘to behave impudently’ (XLVII), κοράσιον > κόριον ‘(little) girl’ (LVI), λιθάριον > λιθίδιον ‘pebble’ (CLVIII), ἀρτοκόπος > ἀρτοποιός ‘baker’ (CXCIII), πάπυρος > βιβλος ‘papyrus’ (CCLXXI), and φάγομαι > ἐδομαί ‘I eat’ (CCCI). In other cases, Phrynichus gives a comment about the proper semantic usage of specific lexical items, without suggesting an alternative. So, for example, he comments that αὐθέντης (XCVI) should never be used in the sense of ‘master’ (δεσποτής), but always with the sense of ‘murderer’ (αὐτόχειρ φονέως).40

Interestingly, Phrynichus sometimes attributes improper usages to specific social groups, such as doctors (XIX, CXCIV), orators (CXXVIII), farmers (CLXXXI), stoics (CCXLVII, CCCIV, CCLII), and gymnasts (CCLXXIX). On a couple of occasions, he also gives comments about proper male vs. female usages: he notes, for example, that νῆ τῶ θεῶ ‘by the goddesses’ (CXXI) is used for female oaths, and should be avoided by men, and that one should reserve the adjective μέθυος ‘drunk’ for women, using μεθυστικός for men (CXXIX).

In many of Phrynichus’ suggestions, compounding plays an important role. So, for example, he has a whole range of suggestions about verbal compounds which are used with the wrong preposition: ἐμπτυεῖ > καταστήσει ‘he spits upon’ (IX), ἀνεῖναι > διεῖναι ‘to saturate’ (XIX), ἐπιτροπιάζειν > ὑποτροπιάζειν ‘to recur’ (LXV), ἀνατοχεῖν > διατοχεῖν ‘to roll from side to side’ (CXXXIX), ἀφιερώσει > καθιερώσει ‘to dedicate’ (CLVIII), ἐξυπνισθῆναι > ἀφυπνισθῆναι ‘to wake up’ (CC), etc. There are also a couple of examples with nouns. So, for example, he suggests: ὑπόδειγμα > παράδειγμα ‘example’ (IV), βασκάνιον > προβασκάνιον ‘amulet’ (LXVIII), συμπολίτης > πολίτης ‘(fellow) citizen’ (CL), etc. Compounds where a verb is combined with a noun, an adverb, or an adjective, have to be avoided entirely, it seems: καλλιγραφεῖν > εἰς κάλλος γράφειν ‘to write beautifully’ (XCIX), εὔκαιρεῖν > εὐ καλής ἔχειν ‘to have leisure’ (CIII), σιτομετρεῖσθαι > σῖτον μετρεῖσθαι ‘to deal out portions of corn’ (CCCLX), χρησμεύεσθαι > χρήσιμον γενέσθαι ‘to be useful’ (CCCLXVII), αἰχμαλωτισθῆναι > αἰχμάλωτον γενέσθαι ‘to be captured’ (CCCCXVIII), etc. Again, there are a couple of examples with nouns: compounds consisting of a

40 For similar examples, see e.g. XL, LV, LXXXI, LXXXII, CX, CCXVI, CCLII, CCCLV (nouns); LXXVI, LXXX (verbs).
noun and an adjective or second noun are to be avoided. So, for example, 
μεσοδάκτυλα > τὰ μέσα τῶν δακτύλων ‘spaces between two fingers or toes’
(CLXIII) and οἰκοδεσπότης > οἰκίας δεσποτής ‘master of a house’ (CCCXLVIII).

The Ecloga also contains quite a few entries on adjectives and adverbs. Some
representative entries include ἀπόσαλα > ἐκ παλαιοῦ ‘from of old’ (XXXI), ἄρχηθεν >
ἐξ ἀρχῆς ‘from the beginning’ (LXXV), ἀκμὴν > ἔπι ‘still’ (C), ἔξεπιπολὴ > ἐπιπολὴς
‘on the top’ (CIV), μονόρθαλμον > ἕτερόρθαλμον ‘one-eyed’ (CXII), γελάσιμον >
γελοίον ‘laughable’ (CCV), and βιωτικὸν > χρήσιμον ἐν τῷ βύῳ ‘lively’ (CCCXXXII).

3.2.2 Morphological entries

As Figure 5 shows, quite a few entries in the Ecloga deal with morphology. Both
nominal and verbal morphology are well represented. In the former area, there
are quite a few entries dealing with gender,41 whereby the male article is typi-
cally replaced by the female article.42 So, for example, ὁ ἄρχομαι > ὃ ἄρχει ‘I do not
sense’ not (CCCXXIX), the correct usage being οὐκ αἰσθάνομαι.

41 I classify gender here as morphological. This may be debated.
42 But note τὸ ῥύπος > τὸ ῥύος ‘the dirt’ (CXXVII), ὁ ἐπίδεσμος > τὸ ἐπίδεσμον ‘the outer bandage’
(CCLX), and τὴν κόριν > τὸν κόριν ‘the bug’ (CCLXXVII).
For a more comprehensive account, see Vessella (2018).

When it comes to verbal morphology, proper tense formation is the most discussed issue. Several entries deal with the formation of the perfect, future, aorist and imperfect. So, for example, ἀπελεύσομαι > ἀπέμι 'I will go away' (XXVI), ἐπεξελευσόμενος > ἐπεξή 'to be marching out' (XXVII) (future); καταφύσκει > καταφυράκτη 'he is buried' (XXIV), ὠμοκε > ὠμόκε 'he has sworn' (XXV), τέτευχε > τετύχηκε 'he has obtained' (CCCLXXIII) (perfect); ἤγος > ἤσθα 'you were' (CXXIV), ἔφης > ἔφησθα 'you said' (CXXV), ἢμην > ἢν 'I was' (CXXI) (imperfect); εὐράσθαι > εὐρέσθα 'to have found' (CV), ἀφείλατο > ἀφείλετο 'he has taken away' (CXXI), ἰνα ἄξων παν ἰνα ἄγων ἐστίν 'so that they bring' (CLXXI), ἐκληυτός > ἐκληυτῶν 'having abandoned' (CCCLXII) (aorist). In one case, the perfect tense is preferred to the present tense: γρηγορόν > γρηγόρον 'I am awake' (CXXV). A couple of other entries deal with the augment, e.g. περιεσήσσεν > περιεσήσσε 'it was more than enough' (XX) and τεθελήκεναι > τεθήληκέναι 'to have wanted' (CCCVII).

An issue that is addressed multiple times in the Ecloga is contract verb formation: so, for example, πεινᾶν > πεινήν 'to be hungry' (XLII), λούομαι > λούμαι 'I bathe' (CLXV), ῥέει > ῥέϊ 'it flows' (CXXV), ἐκεῖτο > ἐκεῖτο 'he begged' (CXXVI), προσδέεσθαι > προσδέεσθα 'to need besides' (CXXVII), γαμῷ > γαμοῦ 'may he marry' (CCLXXIV), and διδοῖ > διδοῖ 'may he give' (CCLXXV). Other entries deal with voice: so, for example, ἀνέψευν ἡ θύρα > ἀνέψκεται ἡ θύρα 'the door has opened' (CXXV) and διεφθοροῦσα ἀίμα > διεφθορηθέν π不但 'destroyed blood' (CCLXXVI).

### 3.2.3 Orthographic entries

The orthographic and orthoepic entries in the Ecloga, which are about as frequent as the morphological entries, concern both vowels and consonants.43

---

43 For a more comprehensive account, see Vessella (2018).
They reflect changes in pronunciation that were ongoing during the Post-classical period, as I also noted with regard to the Katochoi of the Sarapieion archive, although Phrynichus also has an awareness of dialectal differences in the Classical period. In the case of vowels, many of Phrynichus’ entries concern interchanges between long and short vowels: so, for example, ἕνυστρον > ἤνυστρον ‘(fourth) stomach’ (CXL), νήστης > νήςτις ‘fasting’ (CCXCIX), Διονυσείων > Διονύσων ‘the temple of Dionysus’ (CCXCVII), χρέως > χρέος ‘obligation’ (CCCLXX), ἀνυπόδητος > ἀνυπόδητος ‘barefoot’ (CCCICXXIX), and εὐρήμα > εὐρήμα ‘invention’ (CCCICXXVI). There are a couple of comments on interchange between α and ε/η: θέρμα > θέρμη ‘heat’ (CCCVI) and πεντάμηνος > πεντέμηνος ‘five months old’ (CCCLXXVI).

Other entries concern diphthongs: οἰκοδόμηκεν > ψικοδόμηκεν ‘he has built’ (CXXXI), ἀπίκαι > ἀπιέναι ‘to go away’ (VII), νοῦθδον > νοιθδον ‘mind’ (LXIX), ἐλαιὰ > ἐλάαι α ‘olives’ (XCIV), Διόσκουροι > Δίοδόκοροι ‘Dioscori’ (CCXII), etc. There are also some comments on double vowels and the contraction of vowels: ἀλκαϊκὸν > ἀλκαικὸν ‘used by Alcaeus’ (XXVII), ἐπαιοδή > ἐπιφώδη ‘enchantment’ (CCXXIX), νεομήνια > νυμινίνα ‘the first of the month’ (CXXIII), νοσσός > νεοττός ‘young bird’ (CLXXXXII), βαλαντικάλατίς > βαλαντικάλατις ‘cutpurse’ (CCI).

When it comes to consonants, one of the main issues is the wrongful insertion or dropping of consonants such as β, γ, κ, and ω: so, for example, ὁπίθεν > ὁπιθεθέν ‘behind’ (II), μέχρις > μέχρι ‘until’ (VI), ὀρθριός > ορθρίος ‘at daybreak’ (XXIV), ὁψινός > ὁψιος ‘late’ (XXV), σμήγμα > σμήμα ‘soap’ (CCXXVII), βόλβιτον > βόλβιτον ‘cow-dung’ (CCCXXXV), and ἀντικρύς > ἀντικρύ ‘opposite’ (CCXCVIII). There is also frequent discussion of wrongful interchange between two consonants: between voiceless and aspirated voiceless consonants: ἐφιάρκος > ἐφίρκος ‘perjured’ (CLXXVII), πανδοχεῖων > πανδοκεῖων ‘inn’ (CLXXXVI), μόκλος > μόκλος ‘bar, lever’ (CLXXVIII); between voiced and voiceless consonants: ποστάπος > ποδαπός ‘where born?’ (XXIX), διώρυγος > διώρυγος ‘(of a) trench’ (CCX), κρύβεται > κρύπτεται ‘it is being hidden’ (CCXI); between *liquidae*: κλέβανος > κρίνανος ‘vessel’ (CLVI), νίτρον > λίτρον ‘sodium carbonate’ (CCLXXIII); between bilabial consonants: πύελος > μυελός ‘marrow’ (CCLXXII); and between sibilant fricatives and alveolar stops, or sibilant and non-sibilant fricatives: ικεσία > ικέσία ‘supplication’ (III), ὁδηὴ > ὁδηὴ ‘smell’ (LXXI), βαθμός > βασμός ‘threshold’ (CCXCVI). On a number of occasions, Phrynichus also comments on double consonants: so, for example, ἀνειλέειν > ἀνειλλέεν ‘to back’ (XXII), γρυλλίζειν > γρυλλίζειν ‘to grunt’ (LXXIII), and οὐκοκός > οὐκόκος ‘bag’ (CCXXIX).

---

44 So e.g. Ionic (CXCVIII), Doric (CCXVII), and Aeolic (CCLXXIII).
Interestingly, Phrynichus also discusses syllabification, which was considered to be one of the major constituent parts of orthography in antiquity. On various occasions, Phrynichus suggests to reduce the number of syllables, as in the following examples:

- εὐέριος > εὔερος ‘of good wool’ (CXXII), ἐδεδίσαν > ἐδεδίσαν ‘they feared’ (CLIX), στυππίνον > στύππινον ‘of tow’ (CCXXXIII), and ἐνιαυσιάος > ἐνιαύσιος ‘annual’ (CCCXL).

### 3.2.4 Syntactic entries

The syntactic entries in Phrynichus’ *Ecloga* are limited and difficult to group under one heading. A couple of entries deal with proper case usage: so, for example, κληρονομείντονίδε > κληρονομείντονιδε ‘to be an heir of someone’ (CVI), ὑστερίζειν τῷ καιρῷ > ὑστερίζειν τῳ καιρῳ ‘to come too late’ (CCXIII), εὐαγγελιζομαι σε > εὐαγγελιζομαι σοι ‘I bring good news to you’ (CCXXXV), and τίνι διαφέρει > τί διαφέρει ‘in which respect does it differ?’ (CCCLXXII). In one entry, he suggests that a prepositional phrase should be replaced by a bare case:

- τὸν ἀκολουθοῦντα μετ’ αὐτοῦ > τὸν ἀκολουθοῦντα αὐτῷ ‘the one following him’ (CCCXXXI).

Isolated remarks can also be found with regard to participial complementation:

- φίλος μοι τυχάνεις > φίλος μοι τυχάνεις ὁν ‘you are my friend’ (CCXLIV); the definite article: κατ’ ἐκείνο καιροῦ > κατ’ ἐκείνο τοῦ καιροῦ ‘at that time’ (CCXLVI); word order: μὲν οὖν τοῦτο πράξω > τοῦτο μὲν οὖν πράξω ‘so I will do this’ (CCXXII); and tense usage: ἔμελλον ποιῆσαι > ἔμελλον ποιεῖν / ἔμελλον ποιήσειν ‘I intended/was going to do’ (CCCXV and CCCXVI).

Finally, a couple of entries deal with collocations, mostly adverbs and verbs. So, for example, Phrynichus notes that ἐκὼν εἶναι ‘willingly’ should only be used with verbs which contain a negative element in them, as in ἐκὼν εἶναι οὐ μὴ ποιῆσω ‘I will never do it’; a collocation such as ἐκὼν εἶναι ἔπραξα ‘I did it willingly’, he considers a grave error (CCXI). So, too, he notes that ἄρτι ‘just now’ should always be combined with a present or past tense, and never with the future tense (ἄρτι ἤξω ‘I’ll be coming now’ > ἄρτι ἤκω ‘I’ve come just now’, XII), and that ἔνδον ‘inside’ should never be used with a verb of motion (ἔνδον εἰσέρχομαι > εἴσω παρέρχομαι ‘I will go inside’, CV).

45 Note, however, ὑπαίθριον > ὑπαίθριον ‘under the sky’ (CCXXVI).
3.3 The Life of Euthymius (VI/X CE)

The last text which I consider here, the *Life of Euthymius*, was written at a later time, that is, the sixth century CE. Its author, Cyril of Scythopolis, was probably born around 525 CE in the city of Scythopolis, a city which was not only known as a commercial center producing fine linen, but also as a city of monks, because of the association of the area with John the Baptist. As we know from his writings, Cyril grew up in an ecclesiastical milieu, and was educated in the bishop’s house. He was tonsured as a monk in 543 CE, and soon after went to Jerusalem. After a short period as a hermit, he entered the cenobitic monastery of St. Euthymius the Great at Jericho in 544 CE, where he spent ten years. He moved to the New Lavra of St. Sabas in 555, where he started writing a number of biographies of Palestinian monks (seven in total). His literary activity came to an abrupt end with his untimely death in 558/559 CE at the Great Lavra of St Sabas.

Cyril’s writings were linguistically revised during the tenth century by Symeon the Metaphrast. Relatively little is known about Symeon’s life: he was born in Constantinople in an aristocratic family under the reign of Leon VI (886–912 CE), held several high-level administrative posts in the Byzantine civil service, and became a monk towards the end of his life. He died around 987 CE. His major achievement is a voluminous collection of Saints’ Lives, which was organized according to the feasts of the ecclesiastical calendar (hence it is called “menologion”). Many of the texts in Symeon’s *Menologion* had existed earlier, but their stylistic quality varied, which made them seem intolerable or even ridiculous to a highly-educated audience. As Høgel (2002: 138) notes, “in the new cultural climate of the Macedonian renaissance the old-fashioned phrases and word (sic), combined with helpless syntax and sentence structure of the old texts did much to destroy the pious reverence that was the saint’s due.” They were therefore standardized and purified by Symeon, as well as rhetorically embellished.

---

46 For further details, see ODB s.v.
49 As Price (1991: xxxix) notes, archaeological research has uncovered the remains of five monasteries active in the sixth century in the city of Scythopolis.
50 The lives have been edited by Schwartz (1939), and translated by Festugière (1961–1965) in French, and Price (1991) in English.
51 The standard edition is still that by Migne (PG 114–116). For a translation of selected lives, see recently Papaioannou (2017).
52 Peyr (1992) has argued that Symeon’s reworking was not just limited to language, since he added historical details, and made the structure of the narrative more logical and vivid.
Because of the popularity of Symeon’s version (his Menologion becoming standard reading in monastic circles from the eleventh century onwards), many of the older versions disappeared. In some cases, however, as with the Life of Euthymius, both the older and more recent versions have been preserved, giving us a unique opportunity to gain insight into the contemporary linguistic standard.\textsuperscript{53} For the purposes of this contribution, I have linguistically analyzed twenty-one sections in Migne’s edition (IV–XXIV), representing eleven pages of Greek text in Schwartz’ (1939) edition. The picture that emerges from my analysis is that again, lexis plays a (much) more important role than syntax or morphology, as shown in Figure 6:

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure6.pdf}
\caption{Linguistic changes in the metaphrasis of the Life of Euthymius.}
\end{figure}

### 3.3.1 Lexical changes

Almost half of the lexical changes concern verbs.\textsuperscript{54} Quite often, this concerns verbs which imply a certain movement (or absence thereof): so, for example,

---

\textsuperscript{53} For previous studies, see esp. Zilliacus (1938), Peyr (1992), Høgel (2002: 135–149).

\textsuperscript{54} My database also contains about 30 examples of short reformulations, where the phrasing is very similar, but it is difficult to make a clear-cut classification in terms of word class. So e.g. ἔχοντα τὸν πώγωνα μέγαν > βαθὺν τὸν πωγώνα καθαμένον ‘having a long beard’ (20.9; XXI). I will not further discuss these reformulations here.
The first term of each pair is the one in Cyril’s version, the second that in Symeon’s version. Quotations refer to the editions of Schwartz (1939) and Migne (1857–1866).
Interestingly, there are a couple of examples where one word class is changed into another. So, for example, we find ἀσκητικοὺς ἀγώνας ‘ascetic struggles’ > διὰ Χριστόν ἀγώνας ‘struggles because of Christ’ (11.15; VI), προσκυνήσας ‘having venerated’ > κατὰ προσκύνησιν ‘for veneration (of)’ (14.5; X), φιλήσουχος ὃν ‘being fond of silence’ > πρὸς ἡμῖν ‘for silence’ (14.10; X), ἡγήσεσθαι φροντίδος ‘(of) worldly concern’ > τῶν ἡγήσεσθαι φροντίδος ‘(of) concern of worldly matters’ (14.14; X), and φυγεῖν ‘to flee’ > τὴν φυγήν ‘the flight’ (19.3; XVIII).

Finally, there are also changes concerning function words such as particles and prepositions. So, for example, καὶ ‘and’ > εἴτε ‘and then’ (10.19; V), δὲ ‘and’ > οὖν ‘so’ (10.22; V), γὰρ ‘for’ > τοιγιαροῦ ‘therefore’ (12.22; VIII), δὲ ‘and’ > μέντοι ‘but’ (15.4; XI), μέντοι > ἀλλὰ ‘but’ (16.19; XIV); ἐπὶ τὰ ἱεροσόλυμα > εἰς ἱεροσόλυμα ‘to Jerusalem’ (14.1; X), κατὰ τὴν ἔρημον > ἐπὶ τῆς ἔρημος ‘in the desert’ (14.7; X), πρὸς αὐτούς > ὡς αὐτούς ‘towards them’ (16.5; XIII), εἰς τοὺς Χριστιανοὺς ‘towards the Christians’ > κατὰ Χριστιανοῦ ‘against the Christians’ (18.26; XVIII), and εἰς τὴν γῆν > ἐπὶ ἑδάφους ‘on the ground’ (20.26; XXIII).

### 3.3.2 Syntactic changes

At the syntactic level, most of the changes that have been made by Symeon concern word order. Sententially, we see a tendency to place the verb after its complements. So, for example, ἐπεθύμουν οἰκήσαι ‘they desired to live with him’ > ἔκαστος . . . συνοικεῖν ἐδείτο ‘everyone wanted to live with him’ (16.17; XIV), συνήρχοντο πολλοί πρὸς αὐτὸν ‘many came together to him’ > πολλοὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν συνέρρεσαν ‘many streamed together to him’ (16.17–18; XIV), διηγήσαντο μοι > μοι διηγήσαντο ‘they told me’ (18.1; XVIII), λαβὼν τὸν υἱὸν > τὸν παῖδα παραλαβὼν ‘having taken his son’ (19.5; XVIII), ἀπήγγειλεν τῷ πατρὶ ‘he announced to his father’ > τῷ πατρὶ διηγεῖται ‘he described to his father’ (19.10–11; XIX), and συνέθεον τῷ θεῶι > τῷ θεῷ ἐπηγγείλω ‘you have offered to the Lord’ (20.11; XXI). The same tendency can be seen at lower and higher levels. In the noun phrase, for example, we find changes such as κατοικητήριον θηρίων ‘a dwelling-place for wild animals’ > θηρίων καταφυγή ‘a place of refuge for wild animals’ (15.19–20; XII), ποιμένας τινὰς τοῦ Λαζαρίου > τίνες τῶν τοῦ Λαζαρίου ποιμένων ‘some herdsmen of Lazarium’ (15.23; XIII), and τῆς ἐπαγγελίας κληρονόμους > κληρονόμους τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ‘heirs of the promise’ (21.9; XXIV). Direct speech forms an interesting parallel at the higher, discourse-level: here we see that Cyril consistently places the verb of saying before the speech, whereas Symeon always places it in the middle or at the end of the speech. So, for example, ἔλεγον · μὴ φοβεῖσθε ‘they said: do not fear’ > μὴ φοβεῖσθε . . . ἔλεγον ‘do not fear . . . they said’ (16.2; XIII).
A second word-order tendency which is noteworthy is the splitting of nominal groups. Symeon is quite fond of hyperbaton, much more so than Cyril. So, for example, we find πάσης ἀνθρωπίνης συναναστροφῆς χωριζόμενοι > πάσης ἀνθρωπίνης χωριζόμενοι συναναστροφῆς ‘being separated from all human intercourse’ (14.27; XI), ἦν ἰατρὸς ψυχῶν ‘he was a doctor of souls’ > ψυχῶν ἦν ἐπιμελητὴς ‘he was a curator of souls’ (17.4; XV), τὴν πληγήν ταύτην . . . δεξάμενος > ταύτην δεξάμενος τὴν πληγήν ‘having received this affliction’ (19.22; XX), and ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν πολιτείαν ταύτην ‘having come to this region’ > εἰς τὴν Ἀράβων ἠλθόμεν ταύτην ‘when we came to this Arabic region’ (19. 24–25; XX).

A number of other syntactic changes are worth mentioning. Quite frequently, Symeon has changed the tense of verb forms. Much more so than Cyril, he employs the historic present56 at dramatic moments in the narration.57 So, for example, τέλει τοῦ βίου ἔχρησατο > καταλύει τὸν βίον ‘he brought his life to an end’ (10.5–6; IV), εἴπεν > φησίν ‘he said’ (10.18; V), ἐχειροτόνησαν > χειροτόνεῖ ‘he ordained’ (11.1; V), εὑρὼν > καταλαμβάνουσι ‘they found’ (15.15; XII), and ἠλθέν ‘he went’ > καταλαμβάνει ‘he reached’ (14.9; X). Another frequent phenomenon concerns the omission of the article: on various occasions, Symeon drops the article in the original version. So, for example, τῶν γραμμάτων > γραμμάτων ‘(of) (the) letters’ (11.11; VI), τὰ Ἴεροσόλυμα > Ἴεροσόλυμα ‘Jerusalem’ (14.1; X), ἡ μελέτη > μελέτη ‘(the) meditation’ (18.8; XVII), and ἡ διάκρισις > διάκρισις ‘(the) discernment’ (18.8–9; XVII). There is only one exception: Ἀσπεβέτωι > τῷ Ἀσπεβέτωι ‘(to) Aspebetus’ (19.9; XVIII). In the areas of complementation and relativization, some changes have also been made: among others, Symeon avoids substantivized participles and replaces them with ordinary relative clauses. So, for example τὸν γεγονότα τῆς ἔρημου ταύτης μέγαν κοινοβιάρχην > τὸν γεγονότα τῆς ἔρημου ταύτης μέγαν κοινοβιάρχην ‘the one who became a great cenobitic superior of this desert’ > δὲ τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἔρημον ἐξηγήσατο κοινοβιάς ‘who was a leader of the cenobitic monks in this desert’ (16.14–15; XIV) and τὴν μέχρι τοῦ νῦν σωιζομένην > τὴν μέχρι τοῦ νῦν σωιζομένην ‘the one preserved even now’ > ἤτοι καὶ εἰς τὸ δὲ χρόνου μένει συνισταμένη ‘which up until this time remains in existence’ (21.1; XXIV). He also has a distinct preference for indirect over direct speech.58 So, for example, καὶ λέγει· τί ἔστιν ὃ ζητεῖτε ‘and he said: what is it that you search’ > τὴν χρείαν ἤτοις αὐτῶς ἀγάγοι διεπυνθάνετο ‘he inquired about the

57 On a couple of occasions, however, Symeon changes an original historical present form into an imperfect or aorist. So, for example, λέγει ‘he said’ > διεπυνθάνετο ‘he inquired’ (19.17; XIX), θεωρῶ ‘I saw’ > ἐδόκουν ὃραν ‘I seemed to be seeing’ (20.9; XXI), λέγει > εἶπεν ‘he said’ (20.10; XXI), and λέγει > ἔφη ‘he said’ (20.13; XXI).
need that brought them’ (19.17; XIX) and ἐμοὶ δὲ πάλιν εἰπόντος· ὅσα ὑπεοχόμην τῷ θεῷ, πληρὼ ‘when I said again: “all that I have promised to the Lord, I will fulfill’” (20.12; XXI). Finally, various changes have also been made in the area of case: one case can be replaced by another case, or by a prepositional expression in Symeon’s version. So, for example, ἐξῆλθεν τὴν πόλιν ‘he left the city’ > ἔξελθων τῆς πόλεως ‘having gone out of the city’ (14.1; X), ἐμαυτῷ > πρὸς ἐμαυτόν ‘to myself’ (19.26; XX), and τῆς ὁδοῦ ἱεριχούντων > τῆς πρὸς ἱεριχοῦντα ὁδοῦ ‘of the road to Jericho’ (20.14–15; XXI). In other examples, a prepositional expression is replaced by a bare case. So, for example, μετὰ γέλωτος καὶ ψιθυρισμῷ > γέλωτι καὶ ψιθυρισμῷ ‘with laughter and slandering’ (12.13; VI), διὰ πάσης ἱατρικής ἐπιστήμης καὶ μαγικῆς περιεργίας ‘through all medical science and magical arts’ > πολλαῖς ἱατρικαῖς τε καὶ μαγικαῖς τέχναις ‘by all medical and magical arts’ (19.22–23; XX), and τὴν ἐν Χριστῷ σφραγίδα ‘the seal in Christ’ > τῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σφραγίδι ‘(with) the seal of Christ’ (20.26; XXIII).

3.3.3 Morphological changes

To conclude, the passages which I have analyzed also contain a number of morphological changes. Compared to lexis and syntax, however, these changes are quite minimal, as Figure 6 shows. Most of the morphological changes concern number: in various cases, Symeon has changed singular into plural. So, for example, τῶι ἐκκλησιαστικῶι καταλόγῳ > τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς καταλόγοις ‘(in) the list of the clergy’ (11.2; V), περὶ τὸ τέλος > περὶ τὰ τέλη ‘towards the end’ (18.21; XVIII), and δι’ ἐμοῦ ‘through me’ > δι’ ἐμῶν ‘through us’ (20.16; XXI). The reverse phenomenon is also attested: so, for example, ταύτας καὶ ταῖς τουατάς διδασκαλίαις ‘by these and other teachings’ > τοιαύτης . . . τῆς διδασκαλίας ‘(of) such teaching’ (18.9–10; XVII). Only in one case is a dual form used: ἀμφοτέρους > ἀμφώ ‘both’ (21.5; XXIV). Pronouns are also sensitive to morphological change. The main tendency here seems to be to avoid the morphologically heavier generalizing forms. So, for example, οἴνπετε > οἷς ‘who’ (11.25; VI), ἄπαντες > πάντες ‘all’ (18.12; XVIII), and οὐκίστινας > οὗς ‘who’ (19.6; XVIII).

4 Linguistic levels: A reconceptualization

Traditionally, the different linguistic levels are thought of as being strictly separated. Language is then viewed as a dictionary (the lexicon) with a set of rules
that allow us to decline and inflect idiosyncratic forms (morphology), and to
put them together in a sentence (syntax). Applied to the sources outlined in
Section 3, however, it is not always easy to make a strict distinction between
these different levels: for example, do we consider function words such as par-
ticles to be part of the lexicon, or rather of syntax? Do we consider subtle
changes in verb stem relevant to morphology, or rather to syntax? Is the use
of prepositions a lexical matter, or more a matter of avoiding cases? Is voice a
morphological phenomenon or rather a syntactic one, etc.\textsuperscript{59}

It should thus come as no surprise that various Functionally and Cognitively
oriented linguistic frameworks have proposed to re-interpret these traditional labels:
Systemic Functional Linguistics, for example, speaks about “lexico-grammar”,
lexical items being viewed as “most delicate grammar”.\textsuperscript{60} Cognitive linguists,
too, speak of the “syntax-lexicon” continuum,\textsuperscript{61} the main unit of analysis being
“constructions”, which can be defined very generally as “pairings of form and
meaning”.\textsuperscript{62} Together, all of these constructions, whether they be words, idioms, end-
ings, or syntactic constructions, make up what has been called the “Constructicon”.

Cognitive linguists propose to view lexico-grammatical knowledge in terms
of two dimensions/continua. The first of these is the schematicity continuum,
which ranges from the “substantive” to the “schematic” (contrast e.g. a lexically
filled construction such as [kick the bucket] with the much more abstract
ditransitive construction [S V IO DO]).\textsuperscript{63} The second dimension involves the
complexity continuum, which ranges from “atomic” to “complex” (contrast e.g.
the simple adjective [green] with the expression [kick the bucket], consisting of
multiple words).\textsuperscript{64} Using these two dimensions, we can characterize any con-
struction. Particles, for example, can be characterized as atomic and partially
schematic. Aspectual morphology, too, can be considered atomic and partially
schematic. This type of conceptualization is of interest from another point of
view, too. To be more specific, I hypothesize that the two continua proposed by
Cognitive Linguistics can be related to the user-observer continuum which I
proposed earlier in this chapter. This relationship is illustrated in Figure 7.
My hypothesis is that observer-centered sources will naturally focus more on
constructions that are substantive and atomic, because they are so tangible,

\textsuperscript{59} In the figures and discussion, I have consistently chosen the first option.
\textsuperscript{60} See e.g. Hasan (1987).
\textsuperscript{61} See e.g. Croft & Cruse (2004: 256).
\textsuperscript{62} See e.g. Goldberg (2003: 219).
\textsuperscript{63} See e.g. Croft & Cruse (2004: 255). ‘S’ stands for subject, ‘V’ for verb, ‘IO’ for indirect object,
and ‘DO’ for direct object.
\textsuperscript{64} See e.g. Croft & Cruse (2004: 255).
than user-centered sources, which are not constrained by such motivations. One can observe relevant differences even between the different types of sources discussed in the context of this chapter: it is quite noticeable that syntax (or, in other words, what is complex and schematic) is almost entirely absent in Phrynichus’ *Ecloga*, whereas it is much more prominent in other sources such as the petitions from the Katochoi of the Sarapieion archive or the *metaphrasis* of the *Life of Euthymius*. In fact, I would go even further and argue that due to the fact that observer-related sources pay little attention to syntax in Antiquity, syntactic variation may become more prominent in user-related sources, even more prominent than lexical or morphological variation.65

This type of explanation fits well with previous observations on the position of syntax in Ancient grammatical treatises: Donnet (1967), for example, has argued that when Ancient grammarians address questions of syntax, they do so by concentrating on isolated words, rather than developing a theory of relationships between words.66 For example, Dionysius Thrax presents detailed classifications of word classes such as nouns and adverbs, which he subdivides into thirty-one and twenty-six types respectively, but does not go further than that: the meaning of the enunciation is viewed as that of the combination of the individual words.67

Since in Indian and Arabic grammatical traditions there was a firm syntactic tradition,68 it seems necessary to look at the cognitive status of syntax in combination with culture-specific explanations,69 such as the educational

---

Figure 7: Relating continua to each other.

65 Cf. Horrocks (this volume).
66 Donnet (1967: 39). Robins (1997: 31) notes that “the framework of grammatical description in western Antiquity was the word and paradigm model.”
68 See e.g. Swiggers and Wouters (2003: 27).
69 Next to culture-specific explanations, scholars have also drawn attention to language-specific explanations: (i) when discussing one’s mother-tongue, it is natural to focus less on
As Schenkeveld (2000) discusses, Hellenistic education consisted of three stages: in the first stage, the pupil would learn to read and write; in the second stage, grammar proper, that is, phonology and morphology, together with reading the poets; and in the third and final stage, he would take lessons in rhetoric by a rhetorician, also making compositions of his own. Schenkeveld (2000: 16) observes that pupils at no stage needed a proper training in syntax, and that the development of a syntactic theory was therefore unnecessary. Moreover, one can add that because of this “ascendant” type of formation, syntax was naturally backgrounded: one first started with the letters and individual words, and progressively moved on to the enunciation. Donnet (1967) has also drawn attention to the presence of a philosophical (Stoic) tradition. Philosophers discussed matters related to the sentence, but primarily from a logical, rather than a syntactic, point of view. In Antiquity, people never learned to make a distinction between these two different approaches: affronting the sentential level, they immediately turned to the philosophical approach.

5 Conclusion

To conclude, it may be clear that Hudson’s (1996) hypothesis of syntax functioning as a “marker of cohesion in society” does not hold for Ancient Greek: otherwise, the extensive amount of syntactic variation that I have outlined in this contribution would be difficult to explain. Nevertheless, there seems to be good ground to distinguish between the different linguistic levels: lexis plays a crucial role in all of the sources discussed, whereas morphology and syntax are often less prominent. Orthography, too, plays an important role, but only in certain contexts: in literary texts, we see fewer orthographic changes. To claim,
therefore, that the features which are likely to mark social distinctions are completely arbitrary, and that social markedness is not a property inherent to the manifestations of the linguistic system, but rather is mediated through the social group which realizes such manifestations, as Berruto (2003: 144) does, is probably a bridge too far.

I have argued that the sources which I have analyzed show signs of variation vis-à-vis the different linguistic levels: “observer-related sources” such as Phrynichus’ Ecloga tend to pay a lot less attention to syntax than “user-related sources” such as the petitions in the Katochoi of the Sarapieion archive and the metaphorisation of the Life of Euthymius.\(^{74}\) This I have attributed to the fact that syntax is more schematic and complex, making it less “tangible” for sociolinguistic observations and evaluations. Tentatively, I would argue that it is the same fact which has driven much of the history of modern-day linguistics, which, as Hymes (1974: 89–90) notes, started with the “conquest of speech sounds”, then proceeded to morphology in the 1930s and 1940s, and in the 1960s expanded to syntax. Only in a later stage did scholars come to study what is most abstract, that is, pragmatics and (discourse) semantics.

To conclude, it is perhaps ironic that while pronunciation/orthography and especially lexis played a crucial role in Antiquity, these are not the domains which nowadays receive most interest in Classical studies.\(^ {75}\) In papyrology, for example, the standard lexicon remains Preisigke (1925–1927) (followed by various supplements), documentary examples having only been added piecemeal to the main lexicons of Ancient Greek such as LSJ. This, I think, can be attributed to a different mindset: as we are not native speakers of Ancient Greek, we have to invest a lot of time in morphology and syntax, so much so that we are naturally inclined to pay more attention to variation at these levels. On a higher level, academics nowadays largely seem to prefer what is schematic and complex to what is atomic and simple, following current trends in linguistics. At the same time, however, scholars more and more strive towards a more holistic picture, incorporating multiple linguistic theories, different linguistic levels, and various types of sources, as I have tried to do in this chapter.

\(^{74}\) From this perspective, one could agree with Sinner (2013: 127–128) that first-hand observers are bad sources.

\(^{75}\) It is worth signaling, however, recent projects such as the Lexicon of the Zenon archive (led by Trevor Evans), the LBG (led by Erich Trapp), and the Database and Dictionary of Greek Loanwords in Coptic (led by Sebastian Richter).
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